Having heretofore proved by the best testimony, as we believe, the soundness of Gen. Pierce on the subject of Slavery, the Fugitive-slave Law, and the Compromise, and having constantly invited a critical examination of the entire history of his life continue to examine and report upon the views and position of the Whig nominee, Gen. Scott, upon the same momentous question; and in making this investigation, we remark, in advance, that we will not call to our aid the testimony of Democrats, because such testimony, in the language of the Courts, may be said to be testifying in our own behalf. But we will rely exclusively, at this time' upon the testimony of a gentleman of the highest respectability in the Whig party-yea, a gentleman recently nominated by the Whig Convention as their candidate for Congress in this State. His before he received their approval, and was in pos- Page 4. session of the Whig party before his nomination. In other words, by nominating him for that important trust with a full knowledge of the contents of his speech of the 12th June, 1852, they endorsed purpose of placing it before the people in a way that he who "runs may read" and comprehend his skape." -Page 4. meaning, we propose to do so in the simplest possible manner-that is, by questions and answers. Mr. Cabell will please take the stand.

Question .- To what political party do you belong? Inswer .- The Whig party,-Speech June 12,

1852, page 2. Q .- Can the Southern Whig party, and all that is national in the Northern Whig party, consistently with its views of nationality and patriotism and its principles, vote for a Democrat "as President of the United States at the next election?"

A .- It can. Q .- Under what circumstances?

A .- It can if the nominee of the Democratic party "will publicly commit himself to the maintenance of all the measures of compromise and the a Whig who is afraid to avow his sentiments, or is not an advocate of these measures as a smal settlement, and is willing to deceive one section of those I represent."-Page 4. the Union, and to owe his nomination entirely to anti-slavery influences, as will be the case if Gen. Scott should be nominated, as he now stands (June 12th) before the country."-Page 2.

Q .- What was your opinion of the silence of Gen. Scott before his nomination? A .- That it was "unpatriotic electioneering."

-Page 2. Q .- What has been the effect upon yourself of the course which you felt it to be your duty to pursue in regard to the nomination to be made by the

A .- It "has called down upon my head the unmeasured vituperative abuse of the Scott or Freesoil papers of the North, (with few exceptions, they are one and the same,) and I have been bitterly denounced by their Southern coadjutors."-Page 2.

Q .- Why was this abuse specially directed against you? A.—It was "because I expressed my regret that he (Gen. Scott) had not publicly given to the Compromise measures the benefit of the influence of his name, and because I avowed my unalterable determination to stand up to the pledge that I had made to support no man who occupied the non-committal position in which he thought proper to place himself in order to secure anti-slavery votes."-

Q .- What do you propose now (June 12) to do in regard to the pledge of which you have just spoken?

A .- "I intend sacredly to fulfill " it .- Page 2. Q .- Who constituted the great element of Gen. Scott's strength at the North ! A .- "Sectional agitators, Freesoilers and Abo-

litionists."-Page 2. Q .- Who at the South?

A .- "A few miserable party hacks, the columns of whose newspapers show that their editors are ready to sacrifice their principles and their country

for party success and emoluments."-Page 2. Q.—What was the feeling of the anti-compromise men of the North?

A .- "It was vindictive towards Mr. Fillmore because he had exerted his personal and official in fluence to prevent their proposed outrage of the Constitutional rights of the South, and maintained a policy in no way sectional, but essential to the

preservation of the Union."-Page 3. Q .- What did they declare in reference to him A .- "They declared that they would not vote for him or for any one publicly committed to the policy of his Administration, while the Scuth had generally declared that it would support none but such a candidate."-Page 3.

Q.—Who did you believe to be responsible for the failure of the Northern Whig party to stand up to the Compromise?

A .- "I believe Southern gentlemen are responsible, who have shown a willingness to abandon Mr. Fillmore and other Northern patriots like him for one who will not publicly advocate the domes-

tic policy of the present Administration, and who is, for that reason the candidate of the men most inimical to the institutions of the South."-Page 3. INOTE.—This remark of Mr. Cabell's is applicable to those Southern men who were willing to General Scott's nomination over Mr. Fillmore, and was not, we presume, intended to apply to South-ern Whigs who support General Scott after the nomination.]

Q .- After the declarations made in your speech of the 3d February, why are you unwilling to support General Scott?

A .- "I endeavored then to give my reasons. In the course of the remarks I have already made, I have plainly indicated other reasons why he should not be sustained in the position he has thought proper to assume. But I have a few more words to say on this point."-Page 3.

Q.—What have you to say in addition? A .- "The Whigs of every Southern State have with almost entire unanimity, declared they will support no man for the Presidency who is not publicly and unequivocally committed to the maintenance of the Compromise, and are advocates of its finality. Gen. Scott refused pertinaciously to make this avowal, and I have yet to hear of the State Convention or town or county meeting which has expressed a preference for him, with the exception of Delaware, which has not at the same time, expressly repudiated the Compromise, or passed it over in silence."-Page 3.

Q .- Who are the warmest supporters of Gene-

A .- "The vilest and most unscrupulous and uncompromising enemies of the Constitutional rights of the South."-Page 4.

Q .- What would have been the condition of the Free Soil and abolition factions if General Scott had not permitted his name to be siezed and used by Seward and his Northern and Southern coadjutors? A .- "But for the strength of his name, they would have sunk into insignificance."-Page 4.

Q.—As whose candidate did Gen. Scott stand before the country ? - principles in Seward's breeches pocktse, he stood Page 7.

before the country the candidate of the 'higher

law' party."-Page 4. Q. What do those intend who counsel silence

in reference to the Compromise? A.—They "intend to practice a fraud on one section of the country, and hope to profit by that that day the North and South stood face to face sectional strife, the fomentation and continuance of which will be the necessary consequence of this in that regard, we feel it to be our privilege, and which will be the necessary consequence of this we may say a duty which we owe to the public, to silence on the part of the Presidential candidate."

Q.-What will be the nature of the appeal which those who counsel silence, will make to

the people? A .- "Their appeal to the people will be to send men to Congress pledged to carry out their sectional treasonable schemes, and to elect Gen. Scott who will not 'interfere with the action of a maority of the people's Representatives." - Page 4. Q .- Was Gen. Taylor true to the Union, the

Constitution, and the South? A .- He "remained to the hour of his death true testimony we will not assail, because we believe it to the Union, the Constitution and the South. But to be true. The Whigs cannot, because he is their we know that even he was greatly misunderstood candidate, and is endorsed by them as worthy of and misrepresented, and the country sorely felt the all credit—especially since his testimony was given effect of the baneful influence around him."-

Q.—What influence do you now fear ?

A .- " It is this same influence which we now fear. and therefore the Southern States, with one accord, demanded a public, unequivocal declaration from that speech and the truth of his statements. And all Presidential candidates—stronger, if possible, now let us see what is his testimony, and for the in the case of Gen. Scott than from others, because he has presented himself in such a questionable

Q .- What would you merit if you were to give your support to the man who presents himself "in

such a questionable shape?" A .- "Should I give my countenance and support to one who is now a Northern man-who, although a native of Virginia, boasts that he 'owns no slaves,' and declares that he is 'in favor of the gradual emancipation' of the slaves of others, and that 'it is a moral obligation' of those who do own them to 'exterminate' slavery-who is the candidate of the Freesoil element of the Whig party—whose election is specially urged by the enemies of the fugitive-slave law, and other agitators and abolitionists-and whose nomination is barely tolerated by a few Southern men who prefer policy to principle, because he can get more anti-slavery votes than any one else-if, sir, I say, I were to give Constitutional rights of the South, in preference to my support to such a man on the terms proposed,

> Q.-Who do you find the advocates of the repeal of the fugitive-slave law sending as delegates to the Whig National Convention?

A .- " We find them sending as delegates to represent them in the National Convention Mr. Palmer Kellogg, whose official deputies are said to have avowed their determination to resist the execution of the fugitive-slave law, and others whose consciences, like his, compelled them to denounce and revile the law of the land."-Page 5.

Q .- What gentlemen on the floor in Congress did you find to be the most earnest advocates of Scott's nomination ?

A .- "Here on this floor (Congress) we find that entlemen most conspicuous for opposition to the ompromise, especially the fugitive-slave law-gendemen who left the first Whig caucus because it endorsed the Compromise, and others who think with them, are the most earnest advocates of Scott's nomination."-Page 5.

Q.—But supposing there was no doubt as to the soundness of Gen. Scott's private opinions; what had you a right to demand !

A .- " We had a right to demand a public exwill consider that he has already (12th June) put than they did then. off their public avowal too long."-Page 5. Q .- What parties did Gen. Scott allow to rally

inder his name? A .- "He has allowed the anti-slavery and anticompromise parties to rally under his name. Under the cry of Scott and Repeal, the worst agitators and revilers of the laws of the country and the patriots who passed them, have been sent to the Whig National Convention sworn friends to Gen. Scott."-Page 5. Q .- Did General Scott speak before these elec-

A .- "He would not speak before these elections, nor until he had the Convention filled with men committed to him and to his mum policy. I think the Southern people will now say it is too

ate."-Page 5. Q .- Can Gen. Scott's friends say that he was not controlled by others, and by whom? A .- " His best friends cannot say that he is not

now (12th June) controlled by Seward and his followers."—Page 5. Q .- To what organization would Gen. Scott owe

A .- "The organization to which Gen. Scott

yould owe his election would be the same as that which could now, and may in 1856, elect Mr. Seward, and would control the Administration of both or either."-Page 5. Q .- Would the results of the election of Gen. Scott and Mr. Seward be the same?

A .- "The election of the Senator from New York and of Gen. Scott, by such an organization,

would lead to precisely the same results, and the former would follow as the necessary consequence of the latter, if the Union held together till 1856." Q .- What would be the effect of such election?

A .- "The effect would be to open wide the floodrates of abolition agitation and to prostrate every Constitutional Compromise Whig at the North, all of whom will be proscribed and treated as outside barbarians."-Page 5.

Q.—What would be better for the National men of your party?

A .- " Far better will it be for the National men of our party that a Conservative Democrat be elected."-Page 5. Q .- In what light do you regard the election

of Gen. Scott ? A .- " I regard the election of Gen. Scott as the

annihilation of all our Northern friends."-Page 5. Q .- What do you deserve, "if, to please Abolitionists and get their votes, (and that, you say, is the appeal made to you,) you desert those men who, in standing by the Constitution, have stood by you ?"

A .- "We deserve to be spit upon, and to be made the bondmen of those who would liberate our slaves."-Page 6.

Q .- What do you believe in reference to the eply made to the complaint that Gen. Scott refused to write, to wit: "that he had not been ap-A .- That "this is merely absurd, or a frandu-

lent device in keeping with the conduct of many who urge his nomination, to impose upon the people."-Page 6.

Q .- What is your opinion as to the idea that Gen. Scott wanted an opportunity to write?

A.—"The idea" * * "is preposterous."—

Q .- What do you believe those Southern Whig members of the last House of Representatives, who pledged themselves not to support any man who would not commit himself to the policy which Gen. Scott refused to avow, are bound to do? A .- " If they are honorable men, they are bound to oppose the election of Gen. Scott, unless he will,

Tallahassee Floridian. | man shall control the stars.

From the New York Day Book, (Whig.) Great Abelition Victory.

Never since the adoption of the constitution have the abolitionists obtained such a substantial victory as at Baltimore, on the 21st of June, 1852. On in opposing, if not in hostile array. The East, New England, resting upon the constitution, stood aloof from the contest. The South rallied almost to a man on one side, and the North with equal unanimity on the other. The like has never been witnessed since the formation of the government. The Northern phalanx was led on by Johnson, Seward, Greely & Co., and the South was without a leader, only waiting an opportunity to surrender at discretion. The efforts of the Union men were completely paralyzed in the Convention, by the known fact, that a portion of the South were only waiting an opportunity to unite with Johnson, Seward, Greely & Co. But what was the cause of division between the North and the South? Why this determined hostility of the North to Fillmore and this unwavering devotion to Scott? Why this extraordinary unanimity of the South in favor of Fillmore? Let us strip the question of all

drapery and all disguise. Was it not the question of slavery? Was not the North hostile to Fillmore because he had faithfully executed the fugitive slave law, and used his influence in favor of the passage of the compromise measures; and did not the South sustain him for that very cause? Was not Fillmore struck down for this cause alone? Where is the man in the Whig ranks now at the North who will take the position on the slavery question which Fillmore has heretofore occupied? We are of opinion that the South will find very few. The difference will be erceptible in the halls of Congress in forty-eight nours. The news of the nomination was received here with various emotions of dismay by the Union men, and by the abolitionists with astonishment. The abolitionists were overjoyed; they could not believe their good fortunes real. There is no disguising the truth, the Union Whigs of the North have been completely floored. They must now to such tunes as Johnson, Seward, Greely & Co.,

The South has not made much by the Mexican war. Deprived of its share of the conquered territory, the military glory acquired by the generals is appropriated to swell the abolition triumphs. And all this to gratify the penchant of Messrs. Jones, of Tennessee, Botts and Archer, of Virginia, and Stanly, of North Carolina, for office. These may be great men in their several localities, but here they are looked upon as exceedingly smal potatoes, and very few in the hill. We hope they will enjoy their offices when they get them. The convention was a mismanged affair. The South she had in her reach not only the means of protection but of winning a splendid victory for the Union. But, say these South Scott men, we have a platform of principles-all is safe. A fig for your platform. What is the value of a platform with the men who bid defiance to the law and deny the and obligatory than the constitution and the law? large as all the territory now embraced in the Union. Do you think the higher law does not apply to platforms? If you do, you will find yourself mis-taken. If a Union Whig should mention the plat form the abelitionists will leave him in the feet form, the abolitionists will laugh him in the face. gards such an institution as indispensable, in peace

c, and the day of the election ury and the wants of commerce. of Gen. Scott will be still more disastrous. In that event the republic will not last ten years. In 1763 the British crown had no more loval subjects than pression of them, and I think, from all that I can the American colonies, in 1776 they declared their

GEN. PIERCE AT HOME.

A friend of ours, I. V. Pratt, Esq., of Portsmouth, Va., has just returned from a tour through the North, in the course of which he visited the Democratic candidate for President. Gen. Pierce was at home, and received our friend with a warmth and cordiality, expressive of the high regard he entertains for every one who honors him with a call, but more especially a citizen of the Old Dominion. They conversed long and freely upon general topics, politics, &c., in which Gen. Pierce took occasion to allude to the Concord calumny circulated to his prejudice in the South, and which he assured Mr. Pratt was a tissue of falsehoods—a fabrication as vile as the hearts that conceived it-an unmitigated batch of misrepresentations and misstatements. He pointed him with pride and exultation to his public career as recorded upon the annals of Congress, while he had the honor of a seat in either house, and the course he had pursued at home.

"My father," said he, "drew no sword in defence of the North, the South, the East, or the West; but the history of our revolution will show that he ever sought the battle-field in defence of all sections; he knew no North, no South; nothing but common country, and in defence of that he was ready and did pour out his blood. His old age was spent in inculcating into the mind of his boy those principles and sentiments which had ever ruided his rule of action, and I am proud to say, am utterly unconscious of ever having gone counter to those instructions, or been guilty of an act which did not have for its object the best interests of all sections. My brethren of the South have rights, and under God's Providence those rights shall never be invaded by me, or injured danger to their persons and lives than heretofore? through my instrumentality." This is from his own lips, and uttered in the presence of many wit-

their distinguished son, and everywhere, throughout the whole North, the most unheard of unanimity pervades our ranks. Wherever he met with a man who was debased enough to defame or speak lightly of the name of our candidate, there were im- in his 7th of March Speech? mediately a hundred lips curled in contempt for the wretch, and he was shunned by the honest of all parties, as unclean and beneath contempt. Nansemond Enquirer.

A letter from Illinois suggests General Harrison ran with "General Depression," who is a first rate whig, and succeeded; and General Taylor with "General Distraction," who quartered on the enemy : but General Scott " can't come in," as he runs with "General Prosperity," who has no whiggery about him.

The Scott papers prove that there is no truth in the old adage: "Dead men tell no tales." They are satisfied with knowing, that "dead men can't contradict." So they fasten on the deceased Gen. Hugh Brady, the sending of this message to Gen. Scott by some unknown person: "I hope yet to live to see him win the great presidential field of the Union in 1852."

By the way, is it not one of the oddities of the Scott campaign that none of the living Generals dential aspirations?

The Whigs of Jones held a meeting on Saturday last, when Hon. R. S. Donnell was recommended as a suitable person for elector for this District. Not a word was said about Mr. Kerr: not a single Whig now raises his voice to return him thanks, for his distinguished services. Republican & Patriot.

STANDARD

PIERCE, KING AND VICTORY



RALEIGH, SATURDAY, SEPT. 4, 1852.

" No North, no South, no East, no West, under the Constitution; but a sacred maintenance of the common bond and true devotion to the common brotherhood." FRANKLIN PIERCE.

FOR PRESIDENT:

GEN. FRANKLIN PIERCE. OF NEW HAMPSHIRE. FOR VICE PRESIDENT: WILLIAM R. KING,

Democratic Republican Electors. For the State at large, JAMES C. DOBBIN. First District, WILLIAM H. THOMAS, Sixth District, L. O'B. BRANCH. Seventh District, SAMUEL J. PERSON.

Ninth District, THOMAS BRAGG.

THE CHARGES AGAINST GEN. SCOTT.

" 1. The first and most serious charge is, that Gen. Scott is in the hands of Seward, the abolitionists and Seesoilers. For the truth of this charge, among other good and true men, Messrs. Gentry and Williams. Tennessee, are responsible.

2. Another charge against Gen. Scott is, that he i opposed to the existence of slavery. The proof of and slaveholding States to employ ALL MEANS not in-compatible with the safety of both colors to meliorate slavery, EVEN TO EXTERMINATION.

3. Another charge against Gen. Scott is, that he in favor of annexing a large number of free States to the Union, and thus giving to the anti-slavery power an overwhelming weight in the councils of the na-tion. The proof of this charge is found in General Scott's letter, dated June 29, 1849—which we have published in full—in which he says: "In my judgin this contest has been driven to the wall when ment, the interests of both sides would be much promoted by the annexation-the several provinces (Canada, New Brunswick, etc.) coming into the Union on equal terms with our present thirty States." And further: "Though opposed to incorporating with us any district densely peopled with the Mexican race, I should be very happy to fraternize with our northern and north-eastern neighbors." The territory binding obligation of the constitution? Do you which Gen. Scott is thus in favor of annexing to our think they will hold your platform more sacred northern and north-eastern boundaries is nearly as

4. Another charge against Gen. Scott is, that he is The 21st day of June, 1852, was a disastrous and in war, to the successful operations of the treas-

> 5. Another charge against Gen. Scott is, that he is n favor of a hankrupt law. The proof of this charge is also found in his letter of 1841. 6. Another charge against Gen. Scott is, that he is

n favor of a practical destruction of the veto power. In hear, that the great mass of the Southern Whigs independence. Events ripen more rapidly now his letter just alluded to he declares himself in favor ry agitation and the perpetuation of the Union, of reducing the veto-now so essential to the slaveholding States-so as to give a bare majority in Congress the power to overrule it. This would be a practical destruction of the power. 7. Another charge against Scott is, that he is sup-

orted entirely by the enemies of the fugitive-slave aw at the North. The fact that Seward, Johnson, and Greely, the leaders of the higher-law men, are his warm friends, is sufficient proof of this charge. 8. Another charge against Gen. Scott is, that he is in favor of modifying our naturalization laws, so as to admit aliens to the elective franchise upon only one condition, viz: that they serve one year in the army or navy of the United States. The evidence of this charge is found in Gen. Scott's letter of accep- ham refers, was opposed to the last by sixty-six not say this was said in reply to Mr. Hale, not ance, and in a communication written by him to the National Intelligencer in 1844. Taken together, these two documents show him to be in favor of this

dangerous and unjust modification. 9. Another and a most serious charge against Gen. Scott is, that he stubbornly refuses to define his po-sition on the Compromise. The proof of this charge is abundant, but we will not go into it in detail. Suffice it to say that Gov. Jones has declared that he. with a hundred to back him,' implored Gen. Scott

We see the Federal leaders are about call ing meetings in several localities, on the 13th instant, to celebrate the "glorious battles of North Point and Cherubusco." We should like to know what these battles have to do with the question of the Presidency. Will these celebrations of these "glorious battles" have any agency in quieting the Slavery agitation? Will they make Seward a better man? Will they enable Southern men to reclaim their escaped'slaves with more ease and less

But, we are told, these celebrations are intended to show the gratitude of the Whig party to Mr. Pratt says that it was really overpowering Gen. Scott. Indeed-but where is Mr. Fillmore? to hear the sturdy sons of New Hampshire eulogise Is there no gratitude due him for standing up for the fugitive lave law and the Constitution of the country? And Mr. Webster-is there nothing now to admire in the moral courage he displayed

> And what were these same Federal leaders do ing at the very time Gen. Scott was fighting the battle of Cherubusco? Giving aid and comfort to the enemy by opposing the war, and endorsing Tom Corwin in his savage advice to the Mexicans to welcome our brave volunteers "with bloody hands to hospitable graves."

The New York Tribune is berating Mr. Webster pecause he refuses to abandon his position of "armed neutrality " and support Gen. Scott. The Tribune ton-to go back to Boston, be chosen its Repreof the Scot-Seward organs of the free Statessupport their "great commander" in his presi- Daniel Webster, who possesses a world of mind and spits" upon it—Thurlow Weed goes for Scott, result of Abolition testimony? Are we to reje famous 7th of March speech, and was lost!

A.—"With a padlock on his mouth and his himself to this policy before his nomination."

Every man's fortune is in his own hand; a wise sident, Major-General Winfield Scott, Commander-line Demogration on the Major-General Winfield Scott, Commander-line De in-Chief of the Army of the United States?

MR. GRAHAM'S LETTER.

We publish to-day, as we promised to do in our by Mr. Graham and by those who have heretofor last, the letter of the Hon. William A. Graham, to acted with him in the South, as indispensable to the Thomas Loring, Esq., requesting that gentleman to repose and the preservation of the Union. Twelv discontinue the use of his name for the Vice Pres- months ago, judging him and his party in this idency in connexion with that of Mr. Webster for gion by what they said and by what they did, on the Presidency; and also certifying, in a dignified would have inferred, and most justly inferred, the way, to Gen. Scott's soundness on the "comprothey would have staked everything for these mea

Loring, makes two points in his letter, to wit, that in the least degree doubtful; but now we are preconcerning the fact of his nomination with Gen. sented with the extraordinary spectacle of Scott; and secondly, Gen. Scott's position and ac-same gentleman occupying a position on the ticker tion as stated by him, in relation to the "compro- with a candidate for President who had absolutely mise." We shall notice the first point to-day, re-

statement of fact, is true; but how was this nom- and private conversations to show where and what ination obtained, and what are the circumstances he is! More than this: His colleague on the under which it was made? Soon after the pass- ticket is compelled, by the pressure of circumstanage of the "compromise" measures, the Whig ces, to come forward and over his own name declare leaders of New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, un- or certify that he believes him to be sound! der a strong feeling of resentment towards Messrs. Fillmore and Webster because they had endorsed these measures, and knowing that neither of them could, for this reason, run well in the free States, called Conventions, in which General Scott was brought forward for the Presidency without any ry A. Wise. The letter requires no explanation or approval by said Conventions of said "compromise" measures. The prominent actors in these Conventions were the friends and adherents of Mr. Seward, in New York-Gov. Johnston, of Pennsylvania, who has been justly held responsible for the Gorsuch murder, perpetrated in resistance of the fugitive-slave law-and Mr. Vinton, of Ohio, who voted as a member of the House against that

great States, and their Delegates to the Baltimore was made according to what I understood to be Convention were instructed to vote for Gen, Scott -the Convention was held, and Gen. Scott, after this charge is found in his own letter, in which he declares that it is a high moral obligation of masters these States and by the Freesoil influences in the these States and by the Freesoil influences in the Whig party, and opposed by the whole body of slavery by force, it would have to march over his dead Southern Delegates, with the exception of a portion of the Virginia Delegation, was nominated by that Mr. Mapp so declared in Accomack, and he has a bare majority. Are not these things so ?

2d. Gen. Scott was thus nominated in the face of the fact that he had refused, after the passage of the "compromise" measures, to give them his approval over his own name; and for proof of this we refer to his letter of March 26, 1851, in which he "considers," among other things, that if he were to answer in that case he would have to answer other " queries " to " the disgust of the public," the South to suppress it by force if it could not be &c., &c. Does not Mr. Graham know this to be so?

3d. Pending the "compromise" measures, and after their passage, Mr. Fillmore was brought forward by his friends for the Presidency, and Mr. Graham's name was associated with his for the Vice Presidency, upon the ground, as openly and noto- to march upon the South to put down slavery by force, riously avowed, that they were the preferred can- it would have to march over his dead body, for he idates of the advocates in the Whig party of the fugitive-slave law; and it was urged, in all the compromise" Whig papers from Maine to California, as indispensable to the quieting of the Slavethat Mr. Fillmore should be re-nominated and re- repelling the attack when Mr. Mapp said his opporelected. Does not Mr. Graham know these things to be so ?

4th. Gen. Scott, as we have already intimated above, was the preferred candidate of those Whigs had heard him utter, when a gentleman requested me who voted in Congress against the fugitive-slave law, and who now stand ready to vote for its repeal. Does not Mr. Graham know this fact to be so?

Delegates out of 293; and two-thirds of these negative votes were cast by the States of New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio. There were 107 votes from the free States in favor of the platform, and 120 from the slaveholding States, making in all 227; and 66, as we have already stated, from the free States against it. There were 56 votes for to define his position on the Compromise, 'and he this platform by slaveholding States which are undoubtedly Democratic, to wit: Virginia, South Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, Missouri, Arkansas, and Texas; and 34 for it by non-slaveholding States, also undoubtedly Democratic, to wit: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Wisconsin, California, New Hampshire, and Maine. Take these 56 votes from Gen. P. make the declaration which he states, at the 120, and it will leave 64; add these 64 to the only because I know Mr. Mapp to be respectable and 107, and it will make 171; subtract these 34 from 171, and it will leave only 137, thus showing, that to be in exact consonance with the character of Gen. if the endorsement of the "compromise" in the Convention had been left to the pure Whig strength to say in his card of contradiction, which I have just in that body as its exclusive work, it would have seen, that because he (Hale) made no such remarks failed by ten votes-147 being a majority. What does this prove? It proves that if the Whiq party had been consulted, and not the States as States without reference to the side upon which they would throw their votes, the platform of principles so tri-umphantly alluded to by Mr. Graham, anothed not ny as to what Gen. Pierce was heard by him to de umphantly alluded to by Mr. Graham, would not have been adopted. Mr. Graham can make the was fully accomplished both here and at Eastville calculation for himself, if he chooses; he will find have been thus particular in order to correct the get the foregoing to be correct.

the free State Whigs voting for Gen. Scott and all the slaveholding Whigs for Mr. Fillmore or Mr. Webster. Is this what Mr. Graham calls the "regular" action of his party? And the Southern Delegates yielded at last upon the following ex- licly in New Hampshire, "that if an arm, treme grounds: 1st, because they hoped that as a raised to march upon the South to put downsil platform endorsing the "compromise" had been squeezed through, and as the free States had there- body, for he would raise another army 10 0] winds up an article of two columns by advising by secured their favorite candidate, they would ad- it." Can a man who voluntarily utters such Mr. Webster to imitate the example of Col. Ben- here to the platform in good faith; and secondly, timents be hostile to the South or to Souther because as partizans they preferred almost any al- stitutions? Is such a man, who was the adsentative to Congress, and take a seat in the House ! ternative to that of breaking up in confusion, and of of the annexation of Texas, and whose voles Is'nt that cool? Such is the treatment, Southern thus notoriously denationalizing the Whig party. ing his entire service in Congress are units Whigs, which Daniel Webster receives at the hands | Well, how has this platform been treated by the recorded on the side of the Constitutional free State Scott men? Greely "defies, execrates, of the South-is such a man to be put down compared to the scurvy Sewardites who are assail- but protests against the platform—the New York denounce such a friend as Gen. PIERCE ing him-Daniel Webster, who staked himself for Times does the same-while not the first Whig testimony of such miscreants as Foss and Fo the "compromise" measures and the Union in his | meeting in the free States has, to this day, emphatically or cordially approved it. Does not Mr. Graham know these things to be so? How, then, Messrs. Latham and McDougal for Congress. Why does not the Raleigh Register give can he say that the action of the Convention was have received the nomination of Gen. Pierce Gen. Scott his title, in announcing him as the Whig either "regular" or "unanimous," or that the best spirit, and are going for him unanimous," candidate for President? Why not say, For President Major General Wings 11 Sept. G. Southern people are bound by the nomination? The Democratic fires are now brightly being their fires are now brightly being the fires are now brightly brightly being the fires are now brightly br broken on both sides ?

The "compromise" measures have been regarde sures, and would have supported no man for the Mr. Graham, in addition to his request of Mr. Presidency whose position in relation to them was serving comments upon the second until our next. to the time of his nomination, and whose characters 1st. Mr. Graham says "Gen. Scott was regular- as a "compromise" man is so much in doubt that y and unanimously nominated." This, as a naked it is necessary to resort to arguments, dictionaries But for the present we forbear,

IMPORTANT LETTER FROM MR. WISE The Washington Union of Tuesday last contains the following important letter from the Hon, Hencomments-it speaks for itself:

"Only, (near Onancock,) Accomack county, Va. August 22, 1852. To the Editor of the Union :

Sin: A gentleman from Maryland, who was present at a meeting at the court-house of this county in July last, published a report of a dialogue which took place in discussion between Mr. Mapp, the whig subelector, and myself, as the nominated democratic elec tor for this district. From several quarters I have been asked whether the report was correct, and I have law. Mr. Fillmore was set aside by these three replied that it was substantially correct. My reply meaning of the inquiry: Was it true that a whig in public discussion bore testimony to the fact that i himself had heard Gen. Pierce declare in New Ham shire, in public discussion among a non-slaveholdin people, that if an army was raised in the North to march upon the South for the purpose of putting down body, for he would head another to oppose it? I answered to that point of inquiry alone, when I replied since so declared at a meeting in Northampton, at Eastville, the second Monday of this month, in a discussion which then took place between Mr. Botts and myself. The report in the particulars respecting Mr. Hale was not so correct. My question to Mr. Mapp

> "Were you not in New Hampshire some few years ago," (not two years,) "and did you not hear some abolition partisan of Hale, perhaps, declare in public discussion that he regarded slavery as so grievous a sin that an army ought to be marched upon suppressed in any other way ?" Mr. Mapp replied that he was there, and had heard

such a declaration in public discussion. But I do not think he named the person from whom he heard it. then asked him the question: " Was not General Pierce present at the time, and

did you not hear him reply that if an army was raised would head another army to oppose it?"

Mr. Mapp replied, he had heard Gen. Pierce s reply; adding that he (Gen. P.) had no sympathy for slavery, but he was bound to regard the constitu ompact, and to maintain the execution of the laws.

Mr. Mapp had been using the New Boston false hood to prove Gen. P.'s loathing of slavery. I was tunities of knowing Gen. P.'s sentiments were more recent than my own. I had not heard him since I served with him in Congress, but he had heard him speak on the subject of slavery within some few years ack. He did not at first say what sentiments be to put to him the questions which I have mentioned Mr. Mapp's answer was unequivocally in the affirmative, that he had heard Gen. Pierce publicly declare what I have stated, that an army raised to march up on the South to "put down slavery by force would 5th. In the Convention which nominated Gen. have to march over his (Gen. P.'s) dead body, for he Scott, the platform of principles to which Mr. Grawould head another to oppose it." Mr. Mapp did whom it was said in reply; but I exclaimed, as soon as he had borne his ample testimony-

" Such is the language Gen. P. holds to the John P. Hales and other abolition minions in New Hampshire, on the very soil of a free State; and yet he is a whig sub elector who can bear such testimony Gen. P.'s truth to our institutions, assails him in Vi ginia, without himself first disclosing the facts he knows to the contrary, upon the testimony of such a

Thus, I suppose, the error got into the report the remark of Gen. P. was made in reply to Mr. His No matter to whom it was made in reply, it is enough was made, and is vouched by a whig opponent, when is himself vouched as worthy of credit by the entit whig party of this State. Mr. Mapp is not only hig sub-elector, but is a whig member of the Hotel of Delegates from Accomack. I believe he hast eliable for a fact like this, which he stated reluctual against his party, but because I know such a he P., and with his course in the Congress of the Ut ted States. It is, therefore, a non-sequilur for Hall was erroneously, perhaps, attributed to him in the report of the statement of Mr. Mapp, " he (Gen. Pierce) never made any such reply." Mr. Mapp did not say it was made in reply to him; and if it never was made in reply to him, that does not prove it never wa made in reply to some one else. Of that Mr. Map clare publicly in New Hampshire, and that purpo eral statement which I have made, that the report the dialogue between Mr. Mapp and myself at Aco 6th. A sectional battle was fought over this mack court-house was substantially accurate. nomination of Gen. Scott for four or five days, all stantially it was correct as to everything relating

In haste, yours respectfully,

The foregoing letter is perfectly conclusive

establishes the fact that Gen. Pierce did say! ry by force, it would have to march over his

The Democrats of Catifornia have no ing-let no watchman sleep at his post.